

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has reviewed and analyzed the Office Action dated June 15, 2007, and provide the following remarks and comments in response thereto. Applicant notes that the undersigned is new counsel of record pursuant to the Power of Attorney filed September 21, 2007. Claims 1-22 remain pending.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ficco (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0166224, “Ficco”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “looking-up a matching 3-D object in an image library, wherein the library comprises one or more 3-D objects.” Contrary to the Office Action’s assertions, Ficco lacks a teaching or suggestion of such a feature. In particular, the Office Action states that Ficco discloses “looking up a matching 3-D object (wire frame model, texture map) in an image library (advertisement library [0036], advertisements are indexed for retrieval according to desired factor...).” Applicant respectfully disagrees. At most, Ficco discloses a memory device 20 that stores one or more ad segments and that an ad segment may be retrieved or selected based on a particular ad selection factor. paras. [0029] and [0036]. Ficco does not teach or suggest storage of one or more 3-D objects in an image library, much less looking-up a matching 3-D object in such a library, as recited in claim 1. The Office Action’s assertions include discussions of texture maps and wireframes. However, the only mention of texture maps and wire frames in Ficco relate to texture mapping from one wireframe model to another. See, e.g., paras. [0058] and [0090]. Even assuming, without conceding, that a wireframe model constitutes a 3-D object, there is no teaching or suggestion in Ficco of looking up a matching 3-D object in an image library. Indeed, Ficco teaches texture mapping a texture from a first wireframe model to a different wireframe model (i.e., not a matching 3-D object). Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 7, 13 and 19 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-5, 8-11, 14-17 and 20-22 are dependent on claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claim and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6, 12 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ficco. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Ficco fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1, 7 and 13. The Office Action's taking of Official Notice does not cure the deficiencies of Ficco discussed above. Claims 6, 12 and 18 are dependent on claims 1, 7 and 13, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claim.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: December 13, 2007

By: /Chunhsing Andy Mu/
Chunhsing Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000